

ness, its nature and consequences, p. 52.—Baptism, its relation to the Law, p. 63.—Under the Law, p. 65.—Other Objections, p. 68.—Moral Law preceded the Typical, p. 70.—The Law in Galatians, p. 73.—Remarks on 2 Cor. iii, p. 101.—The perfect Law of liberty, p. 115.—Conclusion, p. 117.—Appendix.—Two Laws, p. 120.—The Sabbath.—Teaching of the Saviour, p. 123.—It's Jewish, p. 128.

### WHY DON'T YOU KEEP THE SABBATH?

To the Reader, p. 3.—A question for all Bible Christians, p. 5.—Extracts from Catholic works, p. 15.

### WORD FOR THE SABBATH.

Chap. I—Truth and Error, p. 3.—Chap. II—The Sabbath instituted at Creation, p. 8.—Chap. III—The Sabbath a Memorial, p. 14.—Chap. IV—The Sabbath not Abolished, p. 19.—Chap. V—Apostolic Example, p. 25. Chap. VI—Vain Philosophy, p. 30.

THE

## FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK

NOT THE

## SABBATH OF THE LORD.

"ALL scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. iii, 16, 17.

In this text we are assured that every word of the Sacred Scriptures was given by the Holy Spirit; that every doctrine which men should believe, is therein revealed; that every fault is therein reproofed; every error is corrected by its words of truth; and that perfect instruction in all righteousness is therein given.

The design of its Author in providing such a book, was that the man of God might thereby be made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. This is the treasure which God has given to his church. Nor is this all that he has done. To those who are willing to obey the teachings of his word, he has promised the Spirit to guide them into all truth.

To men thus situated, Jehovah thus speaks: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. v, 21. That is, bring every part of your faith and practice to the test of God's sure word; ask the Holy



Spirit's aid, that your mind may be delivered from prejudice, and your understanding enlightened in the word of truth. Then what you find revealed in that word hold fast; it is of priceless value; but relinquish at once every precept or doctrine not therein recorded, lest you make the doctrines of men of equal weight with the commandments of God. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.

As the first day of the week is now almost universally observed in the place of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, we design in this Tract to examine the grounds on which this observance rests. Those who are willing to submit their opinions to the test of scripture and of reason, are invited to unite with us in the examination of this subject. For what reason do men prefer the first day of the week to the ancient Sabbath of the Lord? On what authority do men continually violate the day which God sanctified, and commanded mankind to keep holy? Come, now, and let us reason together. Here is the commandment which it is said has been changed:—

+ "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." Ex. xx, 8-11. ✕

✕ That this commandment requires men to remember, and to keep holy the Rest-day of the Creator, which he hallowed at the close of the first week of time,

none can deny. We now ask for the authority for the change of this commandment.

Papists believe that their church had power to change the fourth commandment; and, on that authority, alone, they are perfectly satisfied in observing the first day of the week.

Protestants deny the authority of the church of Rome, and attempt to vindicate the change of the Sabbath, by an appeal to the Bible. This is what we wish them to do. We ask them, therefore, to present a single text in which it is said that God has changed his Sabbath to the first day of the week. The advocates of the change have none to offer. If they cannot present such a text, will they give us one which testifies that God ever blessed and sanctified the first day of the week? Its observers admit that they have none to present. ✕ But will they not give us one text in which men are required to keep the first day holy, as a Sabbath unto the Lord? They acknowledge that they have none. How then do they dare to exalt the first day of the week above the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment requires us to remember, and keep holy?

The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto all good works. Can Sunday-keeping be a very good work, when the Bible has never said anything in its favor? Or if it is a good work, can men be very thoroughly furnished in its defense, when God has said nothing in its favor? Instead of being a good work, must it not be a fearful sin against God to thus pervert the fourth commandment, when once the mind has been enlightened on the subject?

But there are several reasons urged for the obser-



vance of the first day of the week, which we will here notice.

FIRST REASON. Redemption is greater than creation; therefore we ought to keep the day of Christ's resurrection, instead of the ancient Sabbath of the Lord.

Where has God said this? Sunday-keepers are compelled to admit that he never did say it. What right, then, has any man to make such an assertion, and then to base the change of the Sabbath upon it? But suppose redemption is greater than creation, who knows that we ought to keep the first day of the week on that account? God never required men to keep any day as the memorial of redemption. But if it were duty to observe one day of the week for this reason, most certainly the crucifixion-day presents the strongest claims. It is not said that we have redemption through Christ's resurrection; but it is said that we have redemption through the shedding of his blood. "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." Rev. v, 9. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; Heb. ix, 12, 15.

Then redemption is through the death of the Lord Jesus; consequently, the day on which he shed his precious blood to redeem us, and said "It is finished," [John xix, 30,] is the day that should be kept as the memorial of redemption, if any should be observed for that purpose.

Nor can it be plead that the resurrection-day is the most remarkable day in the history of redemption,

It needs but a word to prove that in this respect it is far exceeded by the day of the crucifixion. Which is the most remarkable event, the act of Jehovah in giving his beloved and only Son to die for a race of rebels, or the act of that Father in raising that beloved Son from the dead? There is only one answer that can be given: it was not remarkable that God should raise his Son from the dead; but the act of the Father in giving his Son to die for sinners, was a spectacle of redeeming love on which the Universe might gaze and adore the wondrous love of God to all eternity. Who can wonder that the sun was veiled in darkness, and that all nature trembled at the sight! The crucifixion-day, therefore, has far greater claims than the day of the resurrection. God has not enjoined the observance of either; and is it not a fearful act to make void the commandments of God by that wisdom which is folly in his sight. 1 Cor. i, 19, 20.

But if we would commemorate redemption, there is no necessity of robbing the Lord's Rest-day of its holiness in order to do it. When truth takes from us our errors, it always has something better to take their place. So the false memorial of redemption being taken out of the way, the Word presents in its stead those which are true. God has provided us with memorials, bearing his own signature; and these we may observe with the blessing of Heaven. Would you commemorate the death of our Lord? You need not keep the day of his crucifixion. The Bible tells you how to do it.

"For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat;



this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

Would you commemorate the burial and resurrection of the Saviour? You need not keep the first day of the week. The Lord ordained a very different, and far more appropriate memorial. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. vi, 3-5. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. ii, 12.

It is true that the professed church has changed this ordinance to sprinkling, so that this divine memorial of our Lord's resurrection is destroyed. And that they may add sin to sin, they lay hold of the Lord's Sabbath, and change it to the first day of the week, thus destroying the sacred memorial of the Creator's rest, that they may have a memorial of Christ's resurrection! "The earth is also defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant." When will the professed church cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? Not until

"the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left." Isa. xxiv, 5, 6.

SECOND REASON. The disciples met on the day of our Lord's resurrection to commemorate that event, and the Saviour sanctioned this meeting by uniting with them. John xx, 19.

If every word of this was truth, it would not prove that the Sabbath of the Lord has been changed. But to show the utter absurdity of this inference, listen to a few facts. The disciples at that time did not believe that their Lord had been raised from the dead; but were assembled for the purpose of eating a common meal, and to seclude themselves from the Jews. The words of Mark and of John make this clear. "He appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them. Afterward he appeared unto the eleven, as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief, and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." Mark xvi, 12-14. John says: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." John xx, 19.

It is a fact, therefore, that the disciples were not commemorating the resurrection of the Saviour; it is equally evident that they had not the slightest idea of a change of the Sabbath. At the burial of the Saviour, the women who had followed him to the tomb, returned and prepared spices and ointments to embalm him; the Sabbath drew on;



they rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment; and when the Sabbath was past, they came to the sepulchre upon the first day of the week to embalm their Lord. Luke xxiii, 55, 56; xxiv, 1. They kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, and resumed their labor on the first day of the week.

**THIRD REASON.** After eight days Jesus met with his disciples again. John xx, 26. This must have been the first day of the week, which is thereby proved to be the Christian Sabbath.

Were it certain that this occurred upon the first day of the week, it would not furnish a single particle of proof that that day had become the Sabbath of the Lord. But who can be certain that "after eight days" means just a week? It would be nearer a literal construction of the language to conclude that this was upon the ninth day. As an illustration, read Matt. xvii, 1. "And after six days, Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John," &c. Now turn to Luke ix, 28. "And it came to pass, about an eight days after these sayings, he took Peter, and John, and James," &c. Then "after six days" is about *eight days* in this instance. But if "after eight days" means just a week, how does this prove that Sunday has taken the place of the Lord's Sabbath? Rather how does it prove that Sunday has become the Christian Sabbath, when there is not a particle of evidence that either Christ or his apostles ever rested on that day? There is no such term as Christian Sabbath found in the Bible. The only weekly Sabbath named in the Bible is called the Sabbath of the Lord.

Was the act of Christ in appearing to his disciples sufficient to constitute the day on which it occurred

the Sabbath? If so, why did he next select a fishing day as the time to manifest himself to them? John xxi. If it is not sufficient, then the Sunday on which he was first seen of them, the fishing day on which they next saw him, and the Thursday on which he was last seen of them, may not be Sabbaths. It was not very remarkable that Christ should find his disciples together, inasmuch as they had one common abode. Acts i, 13.

**FOURTH REASON.** The Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost, which was the first day of the week. Therefore the first day of the week should be observed instead of the Sabbath of the Lord. Acts ii, 1, 2.

Admitting that the day of Pentecost occurred upon the first day of the week, it remains to be proved that it thereby became the Sabbath. But that it was the feast of Pentecost, and not the first day of the week, that God designed to honor, the following facts demonstrate.

1. While the day of Pentecost is distinctly named, the day of the week on which it occurred is passed in silence.

2. The disciples had been engaged in earnest prayer for the space of ten days; for the day of Pentecost was fifty days from the resurrection of Christ, and forty of those days he spent with his disciples. Acts i. Forty days from his resurrection would expire on Thursday, the day of his ascension. A period of ten days *after* his ascension on Thursday, would include two First-days, the last of which would be the day of Pentecost. If the design of God had been to honor the first day of the week, why did not the Holy Ghost descend on the first of those First-



days? Why must the day of Pentecost come before the Holy Ghost could descend? This answer is obvious. It was not the design of Heaven to honor the first day of the week, but to mark the antitype of the feast of Pentecost. Hence the first day of the week is passed in silence.

The slaying of the paschal lamb on the fourteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the death of the Lamb of God on that day. Ex. xii; John xix; 1 Cor. v, 7. The offering of the first fruits on the sixteenth day of the first month, had met its antitype in the resurrection of our Lord on that day, the first fruits of them that slept. Lev. xxiii; 1 Cor. xv, 20, 23. It remained that the day of Pentecost, fifty days later, should also meet its antitype. Lev. xxiii, 15-21. The fulfillment of that type is what the pen of inspiration has recorded in Acts ii, 1, 2. God has spoken nothing in this place respecting a change of his Sabbath. Yet grave men, calling themselves Doctors of Divinity, consider this text one of their strongest testimonies for their so-called Christian Sabbath. They might be profited by this advice of the wise man: "Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." Prov. xxx, 6.

**FIFTH REASON.** Paul once broke bread upon the first day of the week at Troas. Hence this day was observed as the Christian Sabbath. Acts xx, 7.

We answer, that at one period the apostolic church at Jerusalem broke bread every day. Acts ii, 42-46. If a *single* instance of breaking bread at Troas upon the first day of the week, was quite sufficient to constitute it the Sabbath, would not the continued practice of the apostolic church at Jerusalem

in breaking bread *every* day, be amply sufficient to make every day a Sabbath? Moreover, as the act of the Great Head of the church in breaking bread, must be quite as important as that of his servant Paul, must not the day of the crucifixion be pre-eminently the "Christian Sabbath," as Christ instituted, and performed this ordinance on the evening with which that day commenced? 1 Cor. xi, 23-26.

But on what day of the week did this act of Paul occur? For, if it is of sufficient importance to make the day of its occurrence the future Sabbath of the church, the day is worth determining. The act of breaking bread was after midnight; for Paul preached to the disciples until midnight, then healed Eutychus, and after this attended to breaking bread. Verses 7-11. If, as time is reckoned at the present day, the first day of the week terminated at midnight, then Paul's act of breaking bread took place upon the second day of the week, or Monday, which should henceforth be regarded as the Christian Sabbath, if breaking bread on a day makes it a Sabbath.

But if the Bible method of commencing the day, viz., from six o'clock P. M., was followed, it would appear that the disciples came together at the close of the Sabbath, for an evening meeting, as the Apostle was to depart in the morning. (If it was not an evening meeting, why did they have many lights there?) Paul preached to them until midnight, and then broke bread with the disciples early in the morning of the first day of the week. Did this act constitute that day the Sabbath? If so, then why did Paul, as soon as it was light, start on his long journey to Jerusalem? If Paul believed that Sunday was the Christian Sabbath, why did he thus openly violate it? If he did



not believe it had become the Sabbath why should you? And why do you grasp, as evidence that the Sabbath had been changed, a single instance in which an evening meeting was held on Sunday, while you overlook the fact that it was the custom of this same Apostle to preach every Sabbath, not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles? Acts xiii, 14, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xvii, 2; xviii, 4. X X

Paul broke bread on the first day of the week, and then immediately started on his long journey to Jerusalem. So that this, the strongest argument for the first day of the week, furnishes direct proof that Sunday is not the Sabbath.

SIXTH REASON. Paul commanded the church at Corinth to take up a public collection on the first day of the week; therefore it follows that this must have been their day of public worship, and consequently is the Christian Sabbath. 1 Cor. xvi, 2.

We answer, it is a remarkable fact that Paul enjoins exactly the reverse of a public collection. He does not say, Place your alms in the public treasury, on the first day of the week; but he says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you *lay by him* in store."

J. W. Morton in his "Vindication of the true Sabbath," pages 51, 52, says:—

"The Apostle simply orders, that each one of the Corinthian brethren should lay up *at home* some portion of his weekly gains on the first day of the week. The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression, 'by him;' and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means 'in the collection box of the congregation.' Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, '*by one's self, i. e. at home.*'

Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castelfio, render it, '*apud se,*' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chez soi,*' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst,*' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemselven,*' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se,*' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, '*en su casa,*' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para isso,*' with himself. The Swedish, '*nær sig sielf,*' near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."

The text, therefore, does not prove that the Corinthian church was assembled for public worship on that day; but, on the contrary, it does prove that each must be at his own home, where he could examine his worldly affairs, and lay by himself in store as God had prospered him. If each one should thus from week to week collect of his earnings, when the Apostle should come, their bounty would be ready, and each would be able to present to him what they had gathered. X So that if the first-day Sabbath has no better foundation than the inference drawn from this text, it truly rests upon sliding sand.

SEVENTH REASON. John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, which was the first day of the week. Rev. i, 10.

This is the kind of reasoning which the advocates of Sunday are invariably obliged to adopt. But we ask, What right have they to assume the very point which they ought to prove? This text, it is true, furnishes direct proof that there is a day in the gos-



pel dispensation which the Lord claims as his; but is there one text in the Bible which testifies that the first day of the week is the Lord's day? There is not one. Has God ever claimed that day as his? Never. Has God ever claimed any day as his, and reserved it to himself? He has. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii, 3. "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." Ex. xvi, 23. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. xx, 10. "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day," &c. Isa. lviii, 13. "Therefore, the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark ii, 28.

Then the seventh is the day which God reserved to himself, when he gave to man the other six; and this day he calls his holy day. This is the day which the New Testament declares the Son of man to be Lord of.

Is there one testimony in the Scriptures that the Lord of the Sabbath has put away his holy day, and chosen another? Not one. Then that day which the Bible designates as the Lord's day, is none other than the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

#### THINGS TO BE CONSIDERED.

WE have now examined the main pillars on which the first-day Sabbath rests; and it is perfectly apparent that there is not a single particle of divine authority for the observance of that day. Hence, its advocates must observe the Sabbath of the Lord, or they must resort to the tradition of the "fathers" for proof of its change. The history of the change will be given in its place. But we now ask; what

right had the elders of the Christian church to change the fourth commandment, any more than the elders of the Jewish church had, to change the fifth?

The Pharisees pretended that they had a tradition handed down from Moses, which authorized them to change the fifth commandment. The Papist and Protestant Doctors of Divinity pretend that they have a tradition handed down from Christ and the apostles, authorizing them to change the fourth. But if Christ rebuked the Pharisees for holding a damnable heresy, what would he say to the like act on the part of his own professed followers? Matt. xv, 3-9.

The same fathers which changed the fourth commandment, have also corrupted all the ordinances of the New Testament, and have established purgatory, invocation of saints, the worship of the Virgin Mary and prayers for the dead.

The Protestant professes to receive the Bible *alone* as his standard of faith and practice. The Papist receives the Bible and the tradition of the fathers as his rule. The Protestant cannot prove the change of the Sabbath from his own standard, (the Bible,) therefore he is obliged to adopt that of the Papist, viz., the Bible as explained and corrupted by the fathers. The change of the Sabbath is proved by the Papist as follows:—

"Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferably to the ancient Sabbath which was the Saturday?

"Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolic tradition.

"Q. Does the Scripture any where command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?



"A. The Scripture commands us to hear the Church, [Matt. xviii, 17; Luke x, 16,] and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. ii, 15. But the Scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. John speaks of the Lord's day; [Rev. i, 10;] but he does not tell us what day of the week this was, much less does he tell us that this day was to take the place of the Sabbath ordained in the commandments. Luke also speaks of the disciples meeting together to break bread on the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7. And Paul [1 Cor. xvi, 2] orders that on the first day of the week the Corinthians should lay by in store what they designed to bestow in charity on the faithful in Judea; but neither the one nor the other tells us that this first day of the week was to be henceforward the day of worship, and the Christian Sabbath; so that truly, the best authority we have for this, is the testimony and ordinance of the church. And therefore, those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of other festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act by humor, and not by reason and religion; since Sundays and holy-days all stand upon the same foundation, viz., the ordinance of the church.

"Q. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from the Saturday to the Sunday?

"A. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday, and by sending down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday; as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive church thought the day on which this work

was completely finished, was more worthy her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*.

If further testimony is needed listen to the following:—

"Ques. What does God ordain by this commandment?

"Ans. He ordains that we sanctify, in a special manner, this day, on which he rested from the labor of creation.

"Q. What is this day of rest?

"A. The seventh day of the week, or Saturday, for he employed six days in creation, and rested on the seventh. Gen. ii, 2; Heb. iv, 1, &c.

"Q. Is it then Saturday we should sanctify, in order to obey the ordinance of God?

"A. During the old law, Saturday was the day sanctified; but the church instructed by Jesus Christ, and directed by the Spirit of God, has substituted Sunday for Saturday, so we now sanctify the first and not the seventh day. Sunday means, and now is, the day of the Lord.

"Q. Had the church power to make such a change?

"A. Certainly; since the Spirit of God is her guide, the change is inspired by that Holy Spirit. The uniform, universal, and perpetual tradition of all ages and nations, attest the antiquity of, and consequently the Divine assent to, this change: even the bitterest enemies of God's church admit and adopt it.

"Q. Why did the church make this change?

"A. Because Christ rose from the dead upon Sunday, and rested from the great work of redemption; and because, on this day, the Holy Spirit descended



on the apostles and on the church."—*Catechism of the Christian Religion*.

This testimony shows conclusively that the fourth commandment, which the New Testament has never changed, has been corrupted by the Romish church. It was from Rome, as we may here see, that Protestants learned to say that the Sabbath was changed because redemption was greater than creation. Here we will mention some things for special consideration.

1. Those who are now paying religious respect to the first day of the week, may possibly be led to examine the reasons for this course, by the following significant fact: The church of Rome undertakes to prove purgatory by the Bible, but acknowledges that Sunday-keeping cannot be proved by it, as she instituted that herself. Those, therefore, who despise the Lord's Sabbath, and in its stead honor the sabbath of the Romish church, virtually acknowledge that the authority of that church is above the authority of God, and sufficient to change his times and laws. Here is her statement respecting purgatory:—

"Question. But what grounds have you to believe that there is any such place as a purgatory, or middle state of souls?

"Answer. We have the strongest grounds imaginable from all kind of arguments, from scripture, from perpetual tradition, from the authority and declaration of the church of God, and from reason."—*Catholic Christian Instructed*, page 146.

Hear the Catholic church once more, while she contrasts purgatory with Sunday-keeping:—

"The word of God commandeth the seventh day to be the Sabbath of our Lord, and to be kept holy: you [Protestants] without any precept of scripture,

change it to the first day of the week, only authorized by our traditions. Divers English Puritans oppose against this point, that the observation of the first day is proved out of scripture, where it is said the first day of the week. Acts xx, 7; 1 Cor. xvi, 2; Rev. i, 10. Have they not spun a fair thread in quoting these places? If we should produce no better for purgatory and prayers for the dead, invocation of the saints, and the like, they might have good cause indeed to laugh us to scorn; for where is it written that these were Sabbath-days in which those meetings were kept? Or where is it ordained they should be always observed? Or, which is the sum of all, where is it decreed that the observation of the first day should abrogate or abolish the sanctifying of the seventh day, which God commanded everlastingly to be kept holy? Not one of those is expressed in the written word of God."—*An Antidote, or Treatise of Thirty Controversies*.

Reader, shall not such facts as the above open your eyes? Have you any better authority for Sunday-keeping than Romish tradition? What think you of that prophecy which foretells that the Pope should speak great words against God, and think to change times and laws? Dan. vii, 25. That church who styles her head, "Lord God the Pope," has here openly testified, that without any authority from Scripture, she has changed the commandments of God. She also declares that of her two children, Purgatory and Sunday-keeping, the former is the most important personage. Cannot that mother judge impartially between two such darlings?

2. But perhaps the fathers, as they are called, may be regarded by the reader as the best of authority. We are aware that not a few, who profess to be Bi-



ble Christians, rest their Sunday-observance solely upon such evidence. We request the attention of such to the following from Storrs' *Six Sermons*. It was written in defense of the author's views of future punishment; but the remarks are of equal value with respect to the Sabbath question.

"It is said, 'The *fathers* believed in the *endless* torments of the wicked.' In reply, I remark, Our Lord and Master has prohibited my calling any man *father*. But, if the fathers, as they are called, did believe that doctrine, they learned it from the Bible, or they did not. If they learned it there, so can we. If they did not learn it from the Bible, then their testimony is of no weight. It may have been an error that early got into the church, like many others. Mosheim, in his Church History, tells us, as early as the third century, that the defenders of Christianity, in their controversies, 'degenerated much from primitive simplicity,' and that the maxim which asserted the innocence of defending truth by artifice and falsehood, 'contributed' to this degeneracy. And he adds:—

"This disingenuous and vicious method of surprising their adversaries by artifice, and striking them down, as it were, by lies and fictions, produced, among other disagreeable effects, a great number of books, which were falsely attributed to certain great men, in order to give these spurious productions more credit and weight; for as the greater part of mankind are *less governed by reason* than authority, and prefer in many cases, the decisions of fallible mortals, to the unerring dictates of the Divine Word, the disputants of whom we are speaking, thought they could not serve the truth more effectually than by opposing illustrious names, and respectable authorities, to the attacks of its adversaries.'

"This practice, spoken of by Mosheim, increased as the darker ages rolled on; and through these dark ages, what there are of the writings of the 'fathers' have come down to us. It is a truth, also, that the practice of corrupting the simplicity of the apostolic doctrine was commenced much earlier than the third century. Enfield, in his philosophy, says:—'The first witness of Christianity had scarcely left the world when' this work began. Some of the 'fathers' seemed intent upon uniting heathen philosophy with Christianity, and early commenced the practice of clothing the doctrines of religion in an allegorical dress."—*Fourth Sermon*.

Those who make the "fathers" their rule, would do well to consider the above facts. Every damnable heresy of the Romish church, she proves by those same fathers. Tradition is the unfailing resort of Romanists, to prove their dogmas; indeed, they openly acknowledge that tradition is a part of their rule of faith. Protestants claim that they make the Bible their only rule of duty; but, whenever their unscriptural arguments for Sunday-keeping are exposed, they fly for refuge to the fathers. Thus Protestants defend their heresies with the same weapons that the Papists employ to defend theirs. The same fountain head of corruption feeds the several streams of error that flow through both these bodies.

3. But, says one, do you not think that it would be safe to believe what those have said who conversed with the apostles, or at least, conversed with some who had conversed with them? If such should tell us that the Sabbath of the Lord was changed, would it not be safe to receive their testimony? We answer, that the holy Scriptures come to us with the divine



guarantee that every word therein contained was divinely inspired. The tradition of the elders comes to us without a particle of such testimony. Wherefore it follows that the man who fears God will not reject that which he knows came from heaven, for the sake of following that which directly contradicts it, and which by that fact is proved to have come from the great enemy of divine truth.

But does the Bible contain the least intimation that what was written near the days of the apostles is any more sacred than what was written at a later period? Paul told the Thessalonian church that "the mystery of iniquity," or Romish apostasy, had already begun to work. 2 Thess. ii. If Paul was correct, it follows that it is far from being safe to adopt as sacred truth a doctrine which is not found in the New Testament, merely because it is said to have come from some who lived near the days of the apostles. Satan was then busily engaged in nursing in the bosom of the early church, the viper which should ere long infect with deadly poison a great portion of the professed people of God. Did not Paul warn those with whom he parted at Ephesus, that grievous wolves were to enter among them, and that of themselves men were to arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them? When any doctrine is brought to us from those who lived near the days of the apostles, it is then proper for us to inquire whether this comes from those who spoke the sentiments of the holy apostles, or whether it comes from those grievous wolves who were to follow after them, and speak perverse things.

Is there no way by which we can determine this question? Certainly there is an infallible test. The

New Testament contains the precise language of Jesus Christ and the apostles. Now if the fathers speak according to that word, they speak the precious truths of God. But if they speak that which makes void the word of truth, it is a very strong evidence that they belong to that class which Paul notified the church, should arise in their very midst, and speak perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. If the Holy Spirit has given us notice that false teachers were to arise in the very days of the apostles, should it not serve as a warning to us, that things which purport to come from the successors of the apostles, may, for all that, contain the most deadly poison?

4. If it were certain that the *early* fathers, in their zeal to improve upon the New Testament, changed the fourth commandment, it would only prove that they were of the number of grievous wolves that were to arise. But it by no means follows that the mystery of iniquity was able thus early to change times and laws. The testimony given from Storrs' Fourth Sermon, evinces clearly that even the fathers themselves do not now come to us with their own words. Their testimony has been corrupted, and many shameless forgeries are palmed off as their genuine testimony.

If the reader ever looked into a Romish controversial work, he will there find the very fathers, who are so much relied upon to prove the change of the Sabbath, quoted to prove all the heresies of that anti-christian church. It follows, therefore, that one of two things must be true: either the testimony of the early fathers has been shamefully corrupted, or those so-called early fathers were wolves in sheep's clothing.



5. If the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles were now on earth, mingling with the men of this generation, as they once mingled with a former generation, we ask, Would it be safe for the men of the third or fourth generation from this to receive as sacred truth all that the fathers of the present generation might transmit to them? Is it not self-evident that unless human nature should undergo a radical change, the men of the following generations would have handed down to them as Christ's sayings, all the vain and foolish sentiments that different partizans might wish to maintain? In the case supposed, we ask, What would be the safety of the coming generations? There is but one answer, and in this all will agree. If this were the age in which the New Testament was written, the safety of the coming generation would be secured *only*, by faithfully testing, by that sure rule, whatever might be handed down to them as gospel truth from the fathers of the present age. Should they thus rigidly cleave to inspiration, they would be safe; but if they added to that sure word all the fables which satan would instigate the present fathers to attribute to Christ and the apostles, what would become of them?

If the Advent body itself were to furnish the *fathers* and the *saints* for the future church, Heaven pity the people that should live hereafter! Reader we entreat you to prize your Bible. It contains *all* the will of God, and will make you wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus.

Those who believe in a change of the Lord's Sabbath should look at these facts: The Sabbath of the Lord means the Rest-day of the Lord. Six days the Almighty wrought in the work of creation, and

the seventh day he rested from all his work. The Sabbath or Rest-day of the Lord, is, therefore, a definite day, which can no more be changed to one of the days upon which God wrought, than the resurrection-day can be changed to one of the days upon which Christ did not rise, or the crucifixion-day be changed to one of the six days of the week upon which Christ was not crucified. Hence it is as impossible to change the Rest-day of the Lord as it is to change the crucifixion-day or the day of the resurrection.

Men of God, to whom the Scriptures have been committed, can you longer pervert the commandments of Jehovah and not be guilty of willful transgression? Must it not be exceeding sinful in the sight of Heaven for you to change the Sabbath of the Lord for another day, and then to steal that commandment which guards the holy Sabbath, to enforce the observance of that new day? ✕ When the hailstones of Jehovah's wrath shall sweep away the refuge of lies, [Isa. xxviii, 17; Rev. xvi, 21,] how many of the arguments for Sunday-keeping will be left? The Bible thoroughly furnishes the man of God to all good works. Sunday-keeping is not, therefore, a good work; for the Scriptures furnish nothing in its favor. Why should you be ready of heart to believe what God has never spoken, and slow of heart to believe his plain testimony? Thus saith the Lord, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God;" "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." J. N. A.



## SEVENTH PART OF TIME THEORY

*Shown to be False by the Following from J. W. Morton's Vindication of the True Sabbath.*

THE only object, direct or indirect, of this [the fourth] commandment, is "*the day*." What are we commanded to remember? "*The day*." What are we required to keep holy? "*The day*." What did the Lord bless and hallow? "*The day*." In what are we forbidden to work? In "*the day*." Now let us inquire:—

1. What day? *Not* the day of Adam's fall; nor the day Noah went into the ark; nor the day of the overthrow of Sodom; nor the day of the Exodus; nor the day of the Provocation; nor the day of the removal of the ark; nor the day of Christ's birth; nor the day of his crucifixion; nor the day of his resurrection; nor the day of his ascension; nor the day of judgment. It may be, and certainly is, proper, that we should remember all these; but we are not told to do so in this commandment. Neither is it some one day of the week, but no one in particular; for how could we remember "*the day*," that is no day in particular?—how could we keep holy "*the day*" that has not been specified?—and how could we say that God had blessed and hallowed "*the day*," that was no one day more than another? What day, then? God says, Remember *the Sabbath-day*, or *the day of the Sabbath*; Keep holy *the day of the Sabbath*; The Lord blessed and hallowed *the day*

*of the Sabbath*. He also says, *The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; *in it* thou shalt not do any work. This day, therefore, is "*the seventh day*," or "*the day of the Sabbath*."

2. What Sabbath? Not "*a Sabbath*," or any Sabbath that man may invent, or that God may hereafter keep; for that would be "*some Sabbath*," but no one in particular. Not some institution yet undetermined, that God may require man to observe weekly; for the command is not, "*Remember the Sabbath institution*," but, "*Remember the day of the Sabbath*;" not, "*Keep holy the Sabbath institution*," but, "*Keep holy the day of the Sabbath*." The Lord did not bless and hallow "*the Sabbath institution*," but "*the day of the Sabbath*." We are not forbidden to do work in "*the Sabbath institution*," but in "*the seventh day*." In fact, the phrase, "*the Sabbath*," in this commandment, means neither more nor less than "*the rest*." It is not *here* the name of any institution at all, though it is often thus used in other parts of the Bible. Hence, this Sabbath is "*the Sabbath or rest of the Lord thy God*."

3. Which day of the week is "*the day of the Sabbath*?" No other than that day on which the Lord rested; for the command refers to God's Sabbath. On which day of the week did he rest? "*And he rested on the seventh day*." Gen. ii, 2. Therefore, "*the day of the Sabbath*" is the same day of the week on which God rested from the work of creation; and as he rested on the seventh day of the first week, and on no other, the seventh and no other day of every week must be the only "*day of the Sabbath*."

Let it be particularly observed, that God does not



say, Remember the Sabbath, or, Remember the Sabbath institution, though this is necessarily implied in the command; but, Remember "the day of the Sabbath"—the day on which I have ordained that the Sabbath institution be observed. As if he had said, There is little danger, *comparatively*, that you will forget the fact of my having kept Sabbath; nor is it likely that you will altogether neglect to observe *some* day of rest from your arduous toils, for you will be driven to this by the ever returning demands of your exhausted bodies; but you are, and always will be, in especial danger of forgetting the proper day of the week for honoring me in my own institution. Satan, who takes infinite delight in all kinds of "will-worship," while he hates with a perfect hatred every act of strict obedience to my law, will do all he can to persuade you that some other day will do just as well, or even better. Remember, therefore, the day of my Sabbath, and keep the same day holy in every week; for—mark the reason—I have myself rested on the seventh day, and on that account I have blessed and sanctified that and no other day of the week, that you may observe it, and keep it holy, not because it is in itself better than any other day, but because I have blessed and sanctified it.

There is only one day of American Independence; only one day of the Resurrection of Christ; only one day of the birth of any one man; and only one day of Judgment. And why? Because American Independence was declared on but one day; Christ rose on but one day; the same man cannot be born on two different days; and God hath appointed only one day in which he will judge the world. Now, on the same principle, there can be but one "day of the

Sabbath" of the Lord our God. If I should say that the day of Christ's Resurrection is not any particular day of the week, but only "one day in seven," you would not hesitate to call me a fool, while my ignorance would excite your deepest sympathy; but when *you* say that "the day of the Sabbath" does not mean that particular day on which the Lord's Sabbath occurred, but only "one day in seven," you expect me to receive your assertion as the infallible teaching of superior wisdom. I cannot, however, so receive it, for the following reasons:—

1. If God had meant "one day in seven," he would have said so. His first and great design, in writing his law on tables of stone, was to be understood by his creatures; but, for more than two thousand years after he gave the law, no human being ever suspected that "the day of the Sabbath" meant anything else than the seventh day of the week, because it was commonly known that that day alone was in reality "the day of the Sabbath." Indeed, this "one-day-in-seven" doctrine is known to have been invented within a few hundred years, with the pious design of accounting for a change of Sabbath, without the necessity of repealing a portion of the moral law. It is a matter of great surprise, that those pious theologians, who first substituted "one day in seven" for "the day of the Sabbath," did not shudder at the thought of presuming to mend the language of the Holy Ghost. "The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." Ps. xii, 6. Brethren, are you prepared to enter into judgment, and answer for the liberties you have taken with God's word?



In substituting the vague and indefinite expression, "one day in seven," for the definite and unequivocal terms, "the Sabbath-day," and "the seventh day," you have as truly taken "away from the words of the prophecy of this book," as if you had blotted the fourth commandment from the Decalogue; while your leading object has been to make way for the introduction of a new command that, for aught the Scriptures teach, it never entered into the heart of the Almighty to put into his law.

2. God never blessed "one day in seven," without blessing a particular day. He either blessed some definite object, or nothing. You may say, indeed, without falsehood, that God blessed "one day in seven;" but if you mean that this act of blessing did not terminate on any particular day, you ought to know, that you are asserting what is naturally impossible. As well might you say of a band of robbers, that they had killed "one man in seven," while in reality they had killed no man in particular. No, brethren, yourselves know very well, that God had not blessed and sanctified any day but *the seventh of the seven*, prior to the giving of the written law. You know, that if God blessed any day of the week at all, it was a definite day, distinct from all the other days of the week. But this commandment says, that "the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day." Therefore the Sabbath-day must be a particular day of the week. Therefore "the Sabbath-day" is not "one day in seven," or an indefinite seventh part of time. Therefore it is not "one day in seven" that we are required to remember, and keep holy, and in which we are forbidden to do any work; but "the seventh day" of the week, which was then, is now, and will

be till the end of time, "the day of the Sabbath" of the Lord our God.

3. No day of the week but the seventh was ever called "the day of the Sabbath," either by God or man, till long since the death of the last inspired writer. Search both Testaments through and through, and you will find no other day called "*the Sabbath*," or even "*a Sabbath*," except the ceremonial Sabbaths, with which, of course, we have nothing to do in this controversy. And long after the close of the canon of inspiration, the seventh day, and no other, was still called "the Sabbath." If you can prove that any one man, among the millions of Adam's children, from the beginning of the world till the *rise of Antichrist*, ever called the first day of the week "*the Sabbath*," you will shed a light upon this controversy, for which a host of able writers have searched in vain.

But, farther; the first day of the week was not observed by any of the children of men, *as a Sabbath*, for three hundred years after the birth of Christ. Do you ask proof? I refer you to Theodore de Beza, who plainly says so. If you are not satisfied with the witness, will you have the goodness to prove the affirmative of the proposition?

I infer, therefore, that "the day of the Sabbath," or "the Sabbath-day," is the proper name of the seventh day of the week, as much so as "the day of Saturn;" and that to attach this proper name *now* to some other day of the week, and to affirm that God meant that other day, as much as he did the seventh, when he wrote the law on tables of stone, is as unreasonable as it is impious.

If you say, that when God speaks of "the Sabbath-



day," he means "one day in seven, but no day in particular," you are as far from the truth as if you said that, when he speaks of Moses, he does not mean any particular man, but "some one of the Israelites." Moses *was* one of the Israelites, just as the Sabbath-day *is* one day in seven. But when God says Moses, he means Moses the son of Amram; and when he says "the Sabbath-day," he means the seventh day of the week. You *may* give different names to the same object, without interfering with its identity; but to apply the same name to two different objects, and then to affirm that these two objects are identically the same, so that what is predicated of the one must be true of the other, is as though a navigator should discover an island in the Southern Ocean, and call it "England," and then affirm that the late work of Mr. Macaulay, entitled "The History of England," is a veritable and authentic history of his newly discovered empire. Which would you wonder at most, the stupidity or the effrontery of that navigator?

I cannot close this chapter without reminding you that, in attempting to refute the above reasoning, the main thing you will have to show is, that "the Sabbath-day," or "the day of the Sabbath," is an indefinite or general expression, applicable alike to, at least, two different days of the week, and that it is used indefinitely in this commandment. If it has been proved, that "the day of the Sabbath" refers, and can refer, *only* to the seventh day of the week, then it is true, and will remain for ever true, that the original Sabbath law requires the sanctification of no other day.

Published at the ADVENT REVIEW Office, Rochester, N. Y.

## HISTORY OF THE SABBATH.

THE observance of a different day of the week from that enjoined in the fourth commandment, and for a different reason from that which is there assigned, is by many supposed to be the apostolic mode of rendering obedience to that precept. That such an idea has no foundation in the New Testament, we have already seen. For the benefit of such as wish to learn the manner in which the first day of the week obtained the place of the Lord's Sabbath, we present the following important testimony. It is taken from the "History of the Sabbath," published by the American Sabbath Tract Society, New York. We think that those who will read the testimony on this subject with care, will acquiesce in the frank testimony of Dr. Neander, the distinguished historian of the church. In his "History of the Christian Religion and Church," page 168, he thus remarks: "Opposition to Judaism introduced the particular festival of Sunday, very early, indeed, into the place of the Sabbath. . . . The festival of Sunday, like all other